REMARKS

Claims 1-33 remain in this application. Reconsideration and re-examination of pending claims 1-18 and 23-33 is respectfully requested.

In response to the Office Action mailed April 22, 2005, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

1. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blelloch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,594), Schlansker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,912), Krishna et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,173), Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,820) Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,705), and Naini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,083). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Even if the combination suggested by the Examiner were made, it would still not anticipate the claimed invention because not all claim elements are taught by the combination. For example, regarding independent claim 1 the combination does not teach the Applicant's claimed limitation of "A programmable processor for executing a plurality of programs, said programmable processor comprising: ... an interleaver for interleaving instructions from said plurality of programs..." The Examiner contends that Blelloch et al. discloses this particular limitation. Applicant has previously noted that Blelloch fails to disclose this element. In remarks on Applicant's prior response, the Examiner states as follows:

> Regarding applicant's argument with respect to claim 1, "that the assignment manager AM1 is different than the interleaver because the interleaver interleaves instructions from different programs whereas AM1 assigns different tasks from an individual program to be processed in multiple processors", Blelloch reference discloses sequential programs, implying more than one programs intended for use with a single processor that designates each task and selects a subset of the available tasks for parallel processing (See col.3, lines 10-50)."

Although the Examiner suggests that the term "sequential programs" in Blelloch implies the present invention, there is no need to rely on any implication in Blelloch since the reference clearly defines sequential programs as "intended for use with a single processor" and that "usually employ a sequential scheduler that designates each task of a program with a code or characterization that identifies the ordering of the task in the sequence of instructions." It is clear from the words of Blelloch that it considers "sequential programs" to be a class of programs that are intended to run on a single processor, with a clear ordering of tasks. It is clear from a reading of Blelloch that it operates on a single program at a time (which may be a "sequential program" type of program) and splits the program's tasks to be executed in parallel. Blelloch describes a system for working on a single program at a time. There is no teaching, suggestion, or description in Blelloch, or in any of the cited references, that a processor may be assigned tasks from a plurality of different programs. Thus there is not, and cannot, be in Blelloch, a teaching of interleaving of instructions from different programs, where the different programs are being contemporaneously executed in the system.

Claim 8 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blelloch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,594) in view of Schlansker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,912) and further in view of Krishna et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,173) and futher in view of Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,820) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,628).

Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blelloch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,594) in view of Schlansker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,912) and further in view of Krishna et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,173) and futher in view of Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,820) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,705).

Inasmuch as these dependent claims are based on an allowable base claim. They are themselves allowable.

Claims 3, 14-18 and 23 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blelloch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,594) in view of Schlansker et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 5,710,912) and further in view of Krishna et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,173) and futher in view of Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,820) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Naini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,083). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, the combination suggested by the Examiner fails to teach describe, or suggest the claimed invention. The combination fails to teach the interleaving of instructions from a plurality of programs.

Claims 25-33 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akkary et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,820). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

With respect to claim 25, the Examiner contends that Akkary discloses a target counter because Akkary states: "...thread management logic 124 also ends threads by stopping the associated program counter..." The Examiner concludes that any program counters can be a target program counter based on which thread management logic 124 bases its thread to end on. However, the target counter of claim 25 is coupled to a plurality of program counters. Even if one of the program counters of Akkary could be considered a target counter (and Applicant does not admit that it could) it would still not teach, describe, or suggest the claimed invention because the target counter would not be coupled to a plurality of program counters.

With respect to independent claims 32 and 33 Applicant does not understand the Examiner's comments. The Examiner states that claim 32 is similar in scope to claim 7. Applicant notes that each of the claims stand on their own and does not admit that any claims are "similar in scope". Moreover, claim 32 is an independent claim and claim 7 is a dependent claim, further adding to the confusion of the Examiner's remark. Clarification is requested.

Regarding claim 33, the Examiner states that it is similar in scope to claim 23 and is rejected under the same rationale. Again Applicant does not admit that these claims are "similar in scope". Further, claim 23 was rejected under a combination of patents while claim 33 is rejected only under Akkary. Clarification is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-18 and 23-33 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

A Petition for Extension of Time is filed with this Paper. No other fee is believed due with the submission of this paper. However, if the Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees from Deposit Account No. 502811.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8300. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2005

J.D. Harriman II
Reg. No. 31,967
Customer Number 30076
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90067-1621